

REMARKS

The non-final Office Action mailed on June 22, 2009 has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments have been carefully considered regarding pending claims 1-34 and 42-60.

Applicants hereby amend claims 1, 12, 15, 16, 24, 33, 42, 44, and 53, and claims 3, 17, and 27 are canceled. Claims 1-2, 4-16, 18-26, 28-34, and 42-60 are now pending in the case.

New grounds of rejections of the same claims are made under 35 USC §103. Applicants respond to the rejections below.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Khan and Primary Examiner Douyon for their time in conducting an interview with Mr. Tremitchell Wright and the undersigned on September 22, 2009. Applicants hereby provide a statement of the substance of the interview in accordance with MPEP Section 713.04. The substance of the interview pertained to the remaining rejections to the claims, all under 35 U.S.C. §103, of this pending application. Applicants requested additional explanation as to the nature of rejections within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103.

Agreement with respect to the patentability of the pending claims was not reached, however, the Examiners requested that Applicants submit explanation in writing in response to the final Office Action.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-4, 12-17, 22, 42-44 and 51-54 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Estes et al.* (US 6,045,588) in view of *Carbonell et al.* (US 6,497,921). The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to modify the dry cleaning methods of *Estes* by incorporating into the apparatus the conductive polymer of *Carbonell et al.* because they teach the device is useful to provide corrosion resistance, protection, scratch resistance and solvent resistance.

As noted above claims 1, 12, 15, 16, 24, 33, 42, 44, and 53 are amended. Applicants respectfully submit that *Carbonell et al.*, alone or in combination with the cited references, do not disclose a laundering apparatus comprising components which contact the working fluid and are formed from a conductive polymer.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of rejection under 35 USC §103(a) and respectfully request allowance of claims 1-2, 4-16, 18-26, 28-34, and 42-60 .

Conclusion

In summary, Applicants believes that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action mailed on June 22, 2009, and that Applicants' claims include features that patentably define over the cited references. It is respectfully requested that for the foregoing reasons claims 1-2, 4-16, 18-26, 28-34, and 42-60 of this application be found in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes there are any further matters, which need to be discussed in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2051, referencing our Docket No. US20030459 (31480.6).

Respectfully submitted,

**BENESCH FRIEDLANDER COPLAN
& ARONOFF LLP**

Dated: October 22, 2009

/Eileen T. Mathews/
Eileen T. Mathews
Reg. No. 41,973
2300 BP Building
200 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 363-4451 (Direct)
(216) 363-4588 (Facsimile)